

Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 GENEVA 01346 011600Z

44

ACTION SS-30

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 NSCE-00 CIAE-00 INRE-00 ACDE-00

/031 W

----- 082483

O R 011531Z MAR 74

FM USDEL SALT TWO GENEVA

TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 2235

INFO SECDEF WASHDC

AMEMBASSY MOSCOW

S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 1346

EXDIS/SALT

SPECATE EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDSI

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: COMMENTS ON MARCH 1 MEETING (SALT TWO--386)

1. AT TODAY'S MEETING I MADE PRESENTATION ON BROAD QUESTIONS INVOLVED IN VERIFICATION, ESPECIALLY VERIFICATION OF ICBM MIRVED THROW-WEIGHT LIMITATION. SEMENOV MADE LONG STATEMENT REAFFIRMING THEIR OCTOBER 9 PROPOSAL AND SPECIFICALLY REHASHING IN DETAIL IN EXACTLY THEIR PREVIOUS TERMS THEIR POSITIONS ON ICBMS, SLBMS, BOMBERS AND BomBER ARMAMENT. HE DID NOT SPECIFICALLY REPEAT FBS POSITION TODAY. IN HIS STATEMENT (AS WELL AS IN HIS PRIVATE CONVERSATION WITH ME) SEMENOV MADE PLEA THAT, IN VIEW OF TIME ELEMENT INVOLVED, I BE SURE TO GET OUR ENTIRE POSITION ON THE TABLE AND NOT WAIT FOR ANY ELEMENTS OR NUANCES TO BE DRAWN OUT OF ME BY THEIR QUESTIONS.

2. SHCHUKIN ASKED AT TABLE WHETHER SLBM MIRVS AND "MULTIPLE LAUNCHERS" FOR AIR-TO-SURFACE MISSILES ON BOMBERS DID NOT HAVE SAME PROPERTIES FROM POINT OF VIEW "QUALITATIVE DIMENSIONS OF STRATEGIC BALANCE" AS ICBM MIRVS. TRUSOV ASKED WHETHER OR NOT USDEL INTENDED TO ADDRESS QUALITATIVE LIMITATIONS ON TYPES OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS OTHER THAN THOSE MENTIONED IN MY
SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 GENEVA 01346 011600Z

STATEMENT OF FEBRUARY 26. IN RESPONSE TO MY QUESTION, HE SAID HE HAD IN MIND SLCMS, ETC.

3. QUESTION POSED BY SHCHUKIN AND SEMENOV'S BOMBER STATEMENT GAVE ME GOOD OPPORTUNITY IN MY PRIVATE CONVERSATION WITH SEMENOV TO CARRY OUT FIRST SENTENCE PARA 8 MY INSTRUCTIONS ON SLBM MIRVS, AS WELL AS PARA 2 MY INSTRUCTIONS REGARDING SUBSTANTIALLY EQUAL AGGREGATE THROW-WEIGHT OF CENTRAL STRATEGIC SYSTEMS INCLUDING AN ALLOWANCE FOR BOMBERS. I DID NOT MENTION LIMITING MIRVED SLBMS BY THROW-WEIGHT, SIMPLY SAYING I WOULD BE GLAD TO HEAR ANY THOUGHTS THE SOVIETS MIGHT HAVE WITH RESPECT TO SLBM MIRVS. IN RESPONSE TO MY QUESTION, SEMENOV SAID HE HAD TO "RESERVE HIS POSITION" ON WHETHER THEY WOULD HAVE ANYTHING MORE TO SAY ON SLBM MIRVS. I SAID THAT AT TUESDAY'S MEETING I WOULD BE MAKING STATEMENT BOTH ON SLBM MIRVS AND AGGREGATE CENTRAL SYSTEM THROW-WEIGHT, INCLUDING THE QUESTION OF AN ALLOWANCE FOR BOMBERS. I ALSO REVIEWED FOR HIM THE TOTALITY OF THE CONCEPTS WE HAD NOW PUT FORWARD, POINTING OUT THEIR COMPREHENSIVENESS. IN RESPONSE TO HIS PLEA THAT I ADDRESS MYSELF TO THEIR OCTOBER 9 PROPOSAL, I SAID I HAD ALREADY MADE MY POSITION CLEAR AND WE DID NOT EXPECT TO SAY ANYTHING MORE. I POINTED OUT CONCEPTS WE HAD PUT FORWARD WENT FAR TO PROVIDE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS THEIR OCTOBER 9 PROPOSAL HAD LEFT UNANSWERED. I, OF COURSE, AGAIN STRESSED PRIORITY WE GIVE TO MIRVED ICBM QUESTION.

4. IN PRIVATE CONVERSATION SHCHUKIN RAISED VERIFICATION WITH NITZE, SAYING THAT HE WAS DISAPPOINTED WITH MY STATEMENT TODAY WHICH ASKED QUESTIONS WITHOUT GIVING ANY INDICATION OF OUR VIEWS OF WHAT THE ANSWERS COULD OR SHOULD BE. FROM HIS APPROACH, IT WAS QUITE CLEAR THAT HE HAS BEEN DESIGNATED TO DISCUSS VERIFICATION WITH NITZE, AND HIS GENERAL PURPORT WAS THAT IT WOULD BE HELPFUL IF WE COULD BE MORE PRECISE AS TO HOW WE WOULD PROPOSE TO FORMULATE A MIRV LIMITATION SO THAT IT WOULD BE VERIFIABLE BY NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS. IMPLICATION WAS THAT THEY COULD NOT MAKE DECISIONS WITH REGARD TO LIMITS ON MIRVED MISSILES WITHOUT KNOWING WHETHER IT WOULD BE POSSIBLE TO FORMULATE THE PERTINENT VERIFICATION MEASURES IN A MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE FORM. JOHNSON

SECRET

NNN

*** Current Handling Restrictions *** n/a

*** Current Classification *** SECRET

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 01 JAN 1994
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: MEETING PROCEEDINGS, NEGOTIATIONS, SALT (ARMS CONTROL), SALT II
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 01 MAR 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: GolinoFR
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974GENEVA01346
Document Source: CORE
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: X1
Errors: n/a
Film Number: P740145-0680
From: GENEVA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740379/aaaagyef.tel
Line Count: 104
Locator: TEXT ON MICROFILM, TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 2
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: GolinoFR
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 06 JUN 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <06 JUN 2002 by rowelle0>; APPROVED <27 JAN 2003 by GolinoFR>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> jms 971022
Subject: COMMENTS ON MARCH 1 MEETING (SALT TWO--386)
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005